

Applicant : Lily Ka-Lai Cheng
Application No. : 10/532,977
Page No. : 8

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is respectfully requested. Claims 41, 57, 78-80, and 99-107 are pending. Claims 41, 57, and 78-80 are amended and claims 99-107 are added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Claims 1-40, 42-56, 58-77, and 81-98 are cancelled. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) as conceivably applied to the amended claims are respectfully traversed.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant wishes to express its appreciation to Examiners Torres Ruiz and Muralidar for the courtesies extended to Applicant's attorney during the personal interview on February 24, 2009. During the interview, proposed claim amendments were discussed in view of Sabo. The undersigned agreed to consider claim amendments supported at least by the Fig. 9a-9f embodiments. No agreement was reached during the interview, but it is respectfully submitted that the Examiners will find the amended claims allowable in view of the art of record.

II. Summary of the Amended Claims

As defined in amended independent claims 41 and 78, the present invention is directed to a primary unit and a system, respectively, for inductively powering secondary devices. The primary includes a plurality of nested coils of varying sizes. The primary also includes an activator adapted (1) to sense at least one of the size, the coil size, the power

Applicant : Lily Ka-Lai Cheng
Application No. : 10/532,977
Page No. : 9

requirement, the position, and the rotation of the secondary device and (2) to selectively actuate one or more of the nested coils in response to the sensing result.

As defined in amended independent claims 79 and 80, the invention is directed to a primary unit and a system, respectively, for inductively charging secondary devices. The primary includes first and second coils differing in at least one of size and shape. The primary further includes an activator adapted (1) to sense at least one of the size, the coil size, the power requirement, the position, and the rotation of the secondary device and (2) to selectively activate the first and second coils in response to the sensing.

The present claim amendments are supported at least by Figs. 7b, 7c, 7d, 8b, 9a, 9b, 9c, 9d, 9e, and 9f, as well as the specification.

III. Prior Art Rejections

A. Section 102(d) Rejection

As previously presented, claims 41, 57, and 78-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,803,744 to Sabo.

With respect to amended independent claims 41 and 78, Sabo does not disclose (1) nested coils of varying sizes, (2) an activator adapted to sense at least one of the size, the coil size, the power requirement, the position, and the rotation of the secondary device, or (3) the activator further adapted to selectively activate one or more of the nested coils in response to the sensing result.

With respect to amended independent claims 79 and 80, Sabo does not disclose (1) primary coils differing in at least one of size and shape, (2) an activator adapted to sense at least one of the size, the secondary coil size, the power requirement, the position,

Applicant : Lily Ka-Lai Cheng
Application No. : 10/532,977
Page No. : 10

and the rotation of the secondary device, or (3) that activator further adapted to selectively activate the first and second coils in response to the sensing.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 41, 57, and 78-80 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

B. Section 103(a) Rejection

As previously presented, the subject matter of claims 100-102 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the hypothetical combination of Sabo and U.S. Patent 6,756,697 to Mizutani et al.

Claims 100-102 depend directly or indirectly from claim 78. Therefore these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in conjunction with claim 78.

Further, the subject matter of claims 100-102 is not disclosed or even suggested by Mizutani. The Examiner asserts that the subject matter of these claims is obvious in view of Mizutani, but the Examiner does not suggest why. It therefore is respectfully submitted that the examiner has not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

It therefore is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims 100-102 is improper and/or overcome, and therefore should be withdrawn.

C. New Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 103-107 recite additional features that are not suggested by the art of record. Claims 103, 105, and 107 require the primary coils to be concentric. Claims 104 and 106 require the primary coils of independent claims 79 and 80 to be nested.

Applicant : Lily Ka-Lai Cheng
Application No. : 10/532,977
Page No. : 11

IV. Conclusion

In view of the claim amendments, these remarks, and the discussion during the personal interview, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly and respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ACCESS BUSINESS GROUP
INTERNATIONAL LLC

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP

/Charles E. Burpee/
Charles E. Burpee
Registration No. 29 776
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, NW
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-2487
616.752.2141